DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 449 048 SO 031 537

AUTHOR Riley, Karen L.; Stern, Barbara Slater
TITLE Selling Democracy: Revisiting Rugg for the Next Millennium.
PUB DATE 1999-11-00
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (79th, Orlando, FL, November 19-21, 1999).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Freedom; *Controversial Issues (Course Content); *Democracy; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Progressive Education; Public Education; Social Studies; Student Reaction; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS Proposition 187 (California 1994); Reconstructive Approach; *Rugg (Harold Ordwell); *Social Justice

ABSTRACT

The selling of academic freedom, both on college campuses and in public schools, reflects a certain tension between liberal and conservative forces. Over half a century ago, Harold Rugg's writings, like his textbooks, looked at social problems and how they could be solved. Rugg fell victim to those academic silencers, or gatekeepers of democracy, who curiously chose to view his work as un-American. This paper explores two questions: Is teaching about social justice necessarily anti-American or anti-democratic? and How is the issue of academic freedom connected to the common understanding of democracy? The methods and techniques employed to answer these questions include an interpretation of background studies on Harold Rugg's work and ideas, and an overview of the issue of academic freedom. The paper explains an earlier study, "Shaping the Social Educator," based on California's Proposition 187, which asked to what extent preservice teachers viewed their role as that of the social educator. Considers the extent to which "reconstructionist thought" could be inculcated in preservice teachers across all disciplines and grade levels in the foundations of education course work. (Contains 66 references.) (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 449 048

Selling Democracy: Revisiting Rugg for the Next Millennium.

Riley, Karen L.
Stern, Barbara Slater

SO 031 537

Karen L. Riley

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Paper presented
at
CUFA
Orlando, Florida
November 19-21, 1999
by
Karen L. Riley,
Auburn University at Montgomery
and
Barbara Slater Stern,
James Madison University

SELLING DEMOCRACY: Revisiting Rugg for the Next Millennium

The issue of academic freedom, both on college campuses and in public schools, reflects a certain tension between liberal and conservative forces. While one might easily be persuaded that to support one position necessarily implies a negation of the other, we suggest that a reasonable position for the next millennium is one which supports the related concepts of democracy and social justice. Throughout the 20th century, democracy has been portrayed or interpreted by influential groups as an American ideal whose gatekeepers rank among the ultra-patriots, while social justice as an ideal has been viewed by the gatekeepers as a concept "peddled" to Americans by anti-American groups and individuals. Over half a century ago, Harold Rugg spoke of social justice and social renewal. His writings, like his textbooks, looked at social problems and how they could be solved. Like some who went before him, Rugg fell victim to those academic silencers, or gatekeepers of democracy, who curiously chose to view his work as un-American. In this paper, the authors explore two questions, "Is teaching about social justice necessarily anti-American or anti-democratic?" and "How is the issue of academic freedom connected to our common understanding of democracy?" For Rugg, social justice, academic freedom, and democracy were inextricable ideals. To those who sought to pull his books from the shelf,

charging that children should not be taught the "good" and "bad" features of America, he replied "To keep issues out of the school is to keep life out of it. I try to sell our democracy. I believe in it and I make no bones about it" (Rugg in, Brock, 1941).

In exploring the question, "Is teaching about social justice necessarily anti-American or anti-democratic?" Cherryholmes (1996) probably offers the best answer about why social educators are loath to approach teaching about society and its problems when he says, "Our collective fears of social distrust, civil unrest, and the potential for societal disintegration, this answer goes, is so threatening that it is tempting simply to ignore them." Yet, if something in society has gone wrong, someone must be at fault, so our thinking goes. When looking to place blame, we often see marginalized groups as ready candidates. If teaching about social justice means exploring social issues and problems with the hope of finding solutions, we must understand that like Rugg and the early Reconstructionists, teaching problem solving and reflective thinking may be construed as anti-democratic endeavors. Hence, when teachers, under the guise of social education, begin to teach students to think or consider, they may find that not "teaching the party line," will have serious consequences. In the next millennium, will schools be able, in Ruggerian terms, to "'guarantee the growth of understanding tolerant attitudes, powers of general and reflective thought, critical judgment and appreciation, and meaningful backgrounds of experience for social interpretation and action'" (Bagenstos, 1977, 9), or will educators who promote these concepts be tagged as un-democratic?

The methods and techniques employed to answer these questions include an interpretation of background studies on Harold Rugg, his work and ideas, and an overview of the issue of academic freedom. In addition, the authors will explain their earlier study, "shaping the

social educator," which involved students at two institutions over the course of a semester. The purpose of the study, based upon California's Proposition #187 initiative, was to determine to what extent students viewed their role as teachers as that of the social educator. The authors considered three elements: (1) existing position of student; (2) strength of position; and, (3) change of position over time. The researcher's sought to understand the extent to which "reconstructionist thought" could be inculcated in pre-service teachers across all disciplines and grade levels in the foundations of education course work.

Background: At the start of each semester, one researcher faces her new "Methods of Teaching Social Studies in the Secondary Schools" class and asks two questions. What are social studies? and, what is the role of the social studies teacher? Her students are usually startled and somewhat amused by these questions until they actually begin to wrestle with answering them. It is only at this point, late into their teacher preparation program, with only this methods class and student teaching standing between them and their very own classrooms, that they have been asked to reflect on defining their academic discipline and their role as future social studies educators. In fact, this past semester, this researcher asked her eighteen students to define social studies; dismayingly, not one of them included the concepts of citizenship or democracy in their original definitions. Harold Rugg and the Social Reconstructionists would not have been pleased.

If he were still alive, Rugg might ask: "How could these students have completed more than twelve years of public schooling and not learned the basics of social education?" What are we teaching in our social studies classes if our future social studies educators do not equate their discipline with democratic citizenship – government of the people, by the people and for the people -- in other words, the common good? Wasn't that the original goal when the Committee

of Ten recommended the inclusion of history into the curriculum in 1896? What did Rugg and the Social Reconstructionists mean by education to solve social problems or what Harold Rugg referred to as the "American Problem" (Rugg, H.O., 1939)? This approach is especially relevant today with our current educational trends toward authentic learning, critical thinking, problem solving, and service learning. Additionally, Rugg's work informs the thinking of those who believe that all educators are social educators and that teachers must keep that component of their job in the forefront of their planning as they work in America's schools (Riley and Stern, 1997, 1998).

In order to understand the Social Reconstructionist movement, we must place the leaders in their historical context (Moreo, 1996; Muchinske, 1974; Thomas, 1999; Nelson, 1982). Social Reconstructionism is often seen as an outgrowth of the early 20th century Progressivism of John Dewey. The Soviet Union was a newly established nation embarking at the time on a bold, new socialist experiment. Yet, the extent of the totalitarian reality of the new "communist" government was at the time unknown. At home, the United States, and indeed the industrialized world, plunged into the Great Depression, while Fascism threatened the political order of several European nations. The impact of these events, particularly the economic crisis of the Depression, caused many people to question both the basis of *laissez faire* capitalism and the ability of our system of government to provide stability and answers to the problems we faced as a nation. For social studies educators like Harold Rugg, education held the key to those answers (Rugg, H.O. 1923, 1939). If students, our future citizens, could be taught how to use their knowledge to solve social problems through the process of democratic citizenship, our way of life would not only be preserved, but also improved (Rugg, et al. 1923, Rugg, H.O.,1939; Rugg, E., 1939; Nelson,

1977, 1978).

What would this education program actually entail? From the Progressives, Rugg accepted the interdisciplinary approach. Rugg believed that all curriculum was social studies curriculum and thus, all lessons could be approached through the social studies. He also agreed with the Progressive focus on the scientific method to solve problems that reflected the larger society. Rather than the school reflecting a microcosm of society however, Rugg and the Social Reconstructionists believed that students should immerse themselves in real world problems including working in their communities to find and present solutions that would improve their lives and the lives of their fellow citizens (Rugg, H.O., 1939; Rugg, E., 1939; Bagenstos, 1977; Reitman, 1972).

In addition, the social studies texts prepared by Rugg and his co-authors, contained material on minority groups within our country, including Blacks and women, as well as an understanding that we inhabit a larger, interdependent world. This makes historical sense if one considers Rugg's experiences in our minority and immigrant packed cities such as Chicago and New York, as well as the political debates over America's role in the world, including our refusal to join the League of Nations, the world-wide depression and the backdrop of first one, and then a second, world war, all of which occurred during his lifetime (Bagenstos, 1972; Muchinske, 1974; Rugg, H.O. 1923, 1939).

Thus, Rugg and the Social Reconstructionists viewed the role of the teacher as that of a facilitator guiding students to use the tools of critical thinking and problem solving to study real world problems in the hope of both preserving and of building a more equitable democratic society in the United States. As Progressives they never doubted that the tools of scientific

method coupled with the American spirit would be able to solve these problems (Rugg, H.O. 1939). However, they were convinced that economic and social gaps between the rich and the poor were stifling our democracy, closing down our avenues of opportunity, and blocking our creativity. Rugg believed these issues needed to be studied through the school curriculum so that all Americans would "see the light" to first address and then, to rectify these problems. For Rugg, this was the beauty of democracy – citizens could express their freedom and exercise their liberty by studying, voting and changing the system.

On the face of it, this all sounds harmless enough. What objections could possibly be raised to a curriculum that immersed students in the acquiring and application of knowledge to solve the problems of society? After all, isn't that the purpose of education – the preparation of the younger generation to take its rightful place in society as knowledgeable, productive and active citizens? The answer turns out to be both yes and no depending on whether or not there is agreement on the existence of the problems, and to some extent, on whether or not transmission of knowledge or application of knowledge is viewed as the fundamental purpose of schooling (Bagenstos, 1977, Nelson and Singleton, 1987; Thomas, 1999). Again, placing Rugg and the Social Reconstructionists in their historical context, we must grapple with the fact that America had entered World War II. Did we really want our children focusing on what was wrong with America, all the negatives, when we were all supposed to be pulling together patriotically to win the war? Then, immediately following WWII we were plunged into the period known as the Cold War with our former ally, the Soviet Union, now our archenemy. Any problem solution that called for a redistribution of wealth from the rich to the poor was branded "communist." Even acknowledging that there were problems was problematic. How could the Social

Reconstructionist curriculum address issues of blocked opportunity and economic inequality or dare to suggest the study of things that could be improved in America given the social climate of rabid anti-communism in a world faced with the threat of nuclear annihilation?

Thus, beginning with an effort by the conservative industrialist Malcom Forbes, a crusade to remove the Rugg curriculum and textbooks, the most popular social studies series of their era, was underway. A child of the 1960's might remember a popular bumper sticker of that era, "America, love it or leave it," pasted on the cars of people who did not want to understand that to Rugg and his followers, "loving it" could also mean changing it. The Social Reconstructionist curriculum message was drowned out in a sea of 1950's conformity to the system although their underlying political agenda can be located within the Civil Rights Movement and the protests of the 1960s. The programs of Lyndon Johnson's Great Society stand as proof that the Social Reconstructionists were right -- there really were problems -- and that American citizens could begin to address these problems through the tools of representative democracy.

Today, as American schooling drifts towards an essentialist or "back to basics" approach, with its emphasis on an increasingly more standardized curriculum and high stakes testing for promotion and graduation, what does the philosophy of Harold Rugg and the Social Reconstructionists offer the modern social studies educator (Dinkelman, 1999; Stanley, 1982; Bergen, 1996)? We would make the case that the message of Harold Rugg is ever more important in light of our knowledge of cognitive psychology and brain-based learning. For students to acquire, understand and remember knowledge, curriculum needs to have relevance to their lives. While it is likely that Rugg was incorrect about teaching the entire curriculum through the social studies, it is just as likely that an issues centered, or problem solving approach to social

studies curriculum will be the most successful way to prepare students for their roles as productive and active American citizens (Parsons, 1986; Evans, 1996).

While state legislatures respond to students' ignorance about their nation and their world by mandating courses in U.S. and World history, Alan Griffin (1942) reminds us that there does not appear to be a cause and effect relationship between knowing the data of history and becoming a participating American and world citizen. In our increasingly diverse nation, attention to the problems we hear about in the daily news: racism, nationalism, religious intolerance, or refusal to respect the art of compromise, suggests that a problem centered approach to the social studies would not only improve citizenship but also would increase retention of factual or historical material, thus improving test scores. Hence, we recommend that social studies students heed the call of Harold Rugg for a more vibrant and relevant curriculum. Social studies educators should incorporate a social issues centered methodology which would facilitate the use of the scientific method, critical thinking skills, and democratic decision making in search of problem solutions integrating service learning whenever appropriate.

The questions that arise from advocating this social studies approach are twofold. First, if pre-service and in-service educators have never been exposed to a social issues approach, how will they know how to proceed (Dinkleman, 1999; Evans, 1996)? Second, especially for teachers in public schools wishing to focus on social problems, which are almost always controversial in nature, will they face problems related to the issue of academic freedom as did Rugg with his social studies approach and curriculum materials (Brinkley, 1999)? To address these questions, we will first discuss a social issues model used in Foundations of American Education, a course required of all pre-service teachers in the researchers' respective teacher preparation programs.

We then turn to the issue of academic freedom.

A Case Study on Proposition #187: *(California's 1994 proposed initiative that sought to limit services, including education, to the children of illegal immigrants).*

The pre-service teachers who participated in this study were both undergraduate and graduate students. The project called upon students to use the Internet both for viable social issues-based research, and for communicating their findings to one another. This was particularly valuable as it allowed for dialogue among groups that normally had little access to one another. For example, at Randolph-Macon Woman's College, students frequently express a need to get "beyond the red brick wall" which isolates the campus from the outside world. The opportunity to enter into discussion on this topic with students from Auburn University at Montgomery, a residential and commuter campus with an older and more racially diverse student body, would broaden their contact base far beyond Lynchburg, VA, in several domains including race, socioeconomic status, and gender. For students at Auburn University at Montgomery, the opportunity to enter the world inside the "red brick wall" gave them the chance to meet and speak with students who were having a very different educational experience from theirs.

Their first formal assignment was research based: students were asked to find out as much as they could about Proposition #187. The results of these searches can be considered more than fruitful. While they easily found information about Proposition #187, or what its central arguments were, they also found numerous articles against the proposition. One article which simply "informed" the public about the tenets of Proposition #187 outlined the roles of law enforcement, social services, health care and public personnel as follows: 1) to verify the immigration status of persons with whom they come in contact; 2) to notify certain defined

persons of their immigration status; 3) to report those persons to state and federal officials; and, 4) to deny those persons social services, health care, and education (mscreech@sils.umich.edu). Our pre-service teachers were shocked when they learned that the California law, passed in 1994, required practicing teachers to identify suspected illegal aliens amongst their students and report them to the proper authorities. The student research revealed that the backlash against the proposition was profound.

For example, one student retrieved an article entitled "California (and Beyond): Proposition 187 and Public Health," which outlined the fear of some that contagious diseases might spread if illegal aliens feared exposure to the extent that they refused to seek medical assistance (www.immunet.org/). Other web authors claimed that Proposition 187 will turn teachers and health-care workers into agents of law enforcement officials. To them, "Proposition 187 creates a police state mentality" (http://ca94.election.digital.com/). Still, former governor Jerry Brown's radio program provided material for one writer's article (Kollerer, www.wtp.org/) against the proposition. Kollerer reported the following from Brown's address: "Proposition 187 is a total fraud, laying the foundation for a fascist state. It is putting tools into the hands of the state that will be used against us during times of economic stress. This 'reasonable suspicion' business harkens back to Germany, to the camps that the Japanese were put into, and all the rest of it." Students gathered Internet articles which ranged from statements made by fellows of the American College of Physicians in their 1995 report to ethnic sites such as "LatinoLink," which carried articles which dealt with the constitutional question of California's proposition 187 (www.latinolink.com/). To be sure, the Internet contained far more articles against the proposition than those did which supported the legislation, but there were some sites that

explained the supporter's reasoning.

As students thoroughly researched articles about Proposition #187, they began to formulate their own attitudes about the proposed initiative in general, and about ethnic differences in particular. The instructors chose to help these pre-service teachers focus by creating a few electronic folders or categories to which students could enter their thoughts or responses. Folder categories included "Moral Implications of Proposition #187," "Social Implications," and, the "Morality of Teaching." Not all students contributed to each category, but a survey of those who did include the following: Graduate student Mark B., from Auburn University at Montgomery, a Caucasian male, responded to the Social Aspects of 187. Mark stated, "to my knowledge, every American citizen is given the privilege of an education. Excuse my ignorance, but I do believe it is meant for American citizens. I would not go to Mexico or any other country and expect that country to pay for me an education, so why should I, an American taxpayer have to pay for someone who does not [even] pay into the system. Maybe this is just a Southern attitude, but I can only feel the good tax paying citizens of California want to spend their money in better ways than this." Brett E., another Caucasian male at Auburn University at Montgomery, entered the following: "I am sorry to say that Americans will make some unfounded accusations about illegal immigration due to the recent proposition 187 law. Americans are already a bit intolerant of illegals but the recent controversy will increase that and some incorrect information will be used to make unfounded accusations. We are not very accommodating to them now and I believe it will only get worse."

One female student (Judith S.) from Randolph Macon Woman's College, responding to the Social Aspect of Proposition #187, believed that "the social effect of Prop 187 could be

damaging to the relation[s] between US citizens and nationalities suspected of being illegal immigrants." She posed the question, "if most of the illegal immigrants are from Mexico and Central America will the racial tension increase? Will all Mexican Americans and Latinos be stereotyped as illegal immigrants stealing money from the country?" Her classmate, Andrea S., responding to a question posed by another student responded with "No, I feel that illegal aliens should not have the right to enroll in public schools. Yes, this is a harsh stance however for each illegal alien enrolled a US citizen is not being educated. Thus, I feel that the US must first take care of our own children...[b/c] we all know that there are many children out there that are not receiving the proper public education that they are entitled to." These comments are only a few out of more than 100 entries. What is readily apparent from these few remarks is that students were as divided over the issue of Proposition #187 as California voters, who passed the measure by no more than 59%.

While some students clearly rejected the idea of Proposition #187 as cruel, or supported the proposition in a fashion reminiscent of 1930s "America Firsters," others such Leah C., a Caucasian female student at Auburn University at Montgomery, had difficulty resolving the issue with any measure of clarity. For example, as Leah gathered information from the Internet, her dilemma deepened. Accordingly, she claimed, "I honestly feel that there is not a 'right side' or view to this proposition....I guess that is why I have such a hard time with this. Even though I don't think they should be here illegally - I also feel sorry for all those children." For Leah, Judith, and Brett, the concepts of teaching as a moral or ethical enterprise may find receptive ears. However, for Mark and Andrea, their steadfast convictions against services for the children of illegal aliens suggest that teaching as a moral or ethical enterprise may be concepts which they will

not embrace with sincerity.

Perhaps Mike B., an African American male graduate student at Auburn University at Montgomery, offered one of the most well-thought-out responses, which demonstrates, in part, a willingness to view teaching as a moral endeavor when he wrote the following:

> While the social effects of Prop 187 may be damaging, they do not beg[in] to compare to the social conse[q]uences that this country will face if the measurement goes into effect. Proposition 187 will eliminate social programs in the forms of health care, welfare, food stamps and educational opportunities for many people in this country. Mexican Americans and Latinos are already stereotyped as well as blacks and whites, [G]ermans, and [J]ews. The issue shouldn't be stereotypes, but what the country responsibilities are to all people, especially its children. It is our responsibility to serve all people in this nation regardless of race or economic status.

Clearly, from the responses given in this study, viable solutions to the question of whether or not to provide schooling for the children of illegal aliens were not easily be found. The obvious next question is "How can teachers who themselves are unable to engage in problem solving for social betterment guide students in this endeavor?" The answer is obvious, they cannot. But, social problems are complex and only through repeated experience with problem solving and democratic decision making will pre-service teachers such as ours become experts. Although the instructors hoped for evidence of dramatic shifts in some pre-service teachers' position following this in depth inquiry project, which in fact never materialized, what the Proposition #187 project realized was the following: 1) increased enthusiasm regarding course assignments, evidenced by the length and quality of responses; 2) increased technology skills, assessed by responses on course evaluations; and, 3) and, baseline information regarding student attitudes toward social issues and the role of teachers as social educators.

Our pre-service students were introduced to a problem-based learning approach that

thrust them into the position of decision makers who had to grapple with fundamental problems facing our society. In keeping with a Ruggerian approach to solving social problems through education, those who will be our educators must first experience problem solving within a social context. After all, how can one teach something that one does know? Thus, teachers must first experience the art of examining a problem and then channel their creative forces into finding solutions. However, these lofty goals or aims may prove unattainable in the main. The pre-service teachers in this case study rendered few, if any, solutions to the problem of educating the children of illegal aliens. While they explored the "ethics" of the problem, most were unable to offer a viable solution. Perhaps the short duration of the two programs and is one explanation for their inability to "solve the problem." Another may be the distance of California in terms of geography and psyche.

In any event, a few students did make progress towards an understanding of "the problem." For example, over the course of the term, some students became aware of problems regarding issues of racism in a new way. Rather than just reading about diversity and multiculturalism, students had to face the reality of classrooms where race is an issue. Several responses reflected a concern with "how are teachers supposed to recognize suspicious looking children?" and "isn't that racist?" One apparently outraged student reported that if she wanted to become responsible for identifying illegal immigrants, she would send her resume to the border patrol rather than the school system! Others asked, "aren't we all supposed to be equal?"

One teacher-posted question asked students to consider the following: "Do all children have a right to an education?" Students began to see this as both a philosophical/moral question as well as a political/economic question. This interdisciplinary insight is often difficult to inculcate

in students who like simple cut and dried questions with easy, obvious answers. The cut-and-dried-road is paved with safety, where the road that traverses the uneven ground of teaching critical thinking through an examination of controversial topics, may land one in the lane of indoctrination, a charged leveled at Rugg over his controversial texts and methods. Often, the dividing line is blurred. While pre-service teachers in this study seemed to acknowledge for the first time the politicized nature of the field of education, in the end, they failed to demonstrate in their writings exactly what that meant for them as prospective teachers. Thus, introducing our students to a controversial issue and asking them to research and discuss it in depth did not necessarily produce pre-service teachers who would be capable of helping students examine social issues and search for solutions.

In Ruggerian terms, in order to further the cause of social justice through the moral endeavor of education, one must seek opportunities to engage students in the study of social problems for the purpose of seeking solutions. This task requires a great deal of skill on the part of the teacher, and one that cannot be developed in a single course. It also requires a climate that fosters intellectual freedom. Perhaps the challenge to academic freedom ushered in after World War I and fortified during the Depression, World War II, and Cold War, has been sufficiently strong enough to curb even the mildest appetite for social reform through social education. It was a challenge that Rugg knew only too well.

Harold Rugg and the Issue of Academic Freedom: The challenge for all academicians who yearn to grapple with social or controversial issues in the classroom, whether in the university or in the schoolhouse, is that they run the risk of being given any number of distasteful labels. Yet, the phenomenon of educators seeking to "grapple with social issues" or reform

society through educational endeavors has been a relatively recent development. Until the dawn of the 20th century, most Americans likely believed that problems concerning economics, politics, or society would "iron themselves out" given enough time, or were best left to the politicians, economists, and public policy makers. Educators, however, took their place as reformers within the context of an era of Progressive reform in all sectors. As the United States absorbed more than 20 million immigrants within the decades of 1880 to 1910, differences among them were ameliorated, on the surface, through an assimilation process. This process of "Americanizing" immigrants largely took place in a variety of learning establishments, from the settlement house to multi-storied public elementary schools in urban centers. Thus, educators, influenced by any number of impulses and turn-of-the-century-currents, joined leaders in business, politics, and journalism, to name a few, in the spirit of reform.

Chief among early educational reformers was Harold O. Rugg. Rugg's approach was two-fold. According to Rugg, the "good society" rested upon "…social planning, [and] also upon the development of 'multitudes' of cultured, 'integrated' personalities…" (Carbone, 1969, 128). To him, society was a living entity and not something static. Rugg believed that "the content of the school must be constructed out of the very materials of American life—not from academic relics of Victorian precedents. [Moreover], [t]he curriculum must bring children to close grip with the roar and steely clang of industry, with the great integrated structure of American business, and must prepare them in sympathy and tolerance to confront the underlying forces of political and economic life. Young America must awake to the newly emerging culture of industrialism and she must become articulate." (Nelson, 1978, 120). The forward thinking Rugg, whose embrace of scientific method resulted in a certain optimism and belief in the new

religion of progress, failed to see what Van Cleve Morris (1957) called "the political domination of localism," (218). According to his notions of grass-root-ism, "this new disease in American education, is manifest in the monthly dismissal of teachers for speaking their minds on the issues of the day," (218). Yet Morris' "new disease" was not new and not confined to public school teachers.

Nelson, et al. (1978), in one study of Harold Rugg, addressed the seriousness of academic freedom and its challengers, calling the period between 1930-1940, one of the most repressive. As evidence, the authors pointed to the 1936 text by Beale entitled *Are American Teachers Free*. However, one can look to an earlier period when the issue of academic freedom and its repression loomed large, thus setting a precedent for Nelson's compelling claim. As it turns out, only two years before Rugg accepted a position at Teachers College (1920), Columbia's Board of Trustees earned the distinction of being the first private governing board to set up an investigation committee in order to ascertain whether or not any of the university's programs or professors, teaching or in positions of administration, could be considered subversive (Howlett, 1984). The task of the Committee of Nine, five deans and four faculty, was to examine the faculty's teaching proclivities. While *The Nation* scorned the actions of Columbia's loyalty police, influential faculty members registered their outrage in an angry letter to trustees. In the end, President Nicholas Murray Butler, became one of the few university presidents to "formally withdr[a]w the privilege of academic freedom for the entire duration of the war" (Howlett, 1984, 45). So unrelenting was Columbia's campaign to rid itself of anti-American sentiment within the professoriate that its board of trustees hauled the eminent historian Charles A. Beard before its star chamber panel in order to question him about a speaker he supported who allegedly uttered "'To Hell with the

flag.'" Beard resigned stating flatly "Having observed closely the inner life of Columbia for many years, I have been driven to the conclusion that the University is really under the control of a small and active group of trustees who have no standing in the world of education, who are reactionary and visionless in politics, narrow and medieval in religion..." (Howlett, 48).

The outcry against Columbia's loyalty and academic freedom policies was immediate and fierce. One Columbia graduate believed that the university's position could be likened to the corporate attitude which "'naturally discounts the opinions of the non-investing public'" (Howlett, 49). This alumnus went on to declare that the university-as-a-corporation-model cannot succeed without a supply of revenue. This revenue is largely acquired through graduates, their parents, alumni, and the business sector. Hence, parents whose vague complaints speak of irreligion and sedition emanating from the halls of academe combined with the complaints of influential businessmen who guard against the anti-capitalist rhetoric of rose-tinted professors act together as a powerful check against free speech. This was the Columbia to which Rugg came in the early part of his teaching career.

The flames of controversy at Columbia had barely cooled when Rugg embarked upon a bold new vision for classroom teachers. Teachers, educated toward the ideal of social justice were to be the new foot soldiers in the battle against inequality. Under the umbrella of social reconstruction, progressive educators urged teachers to assume the forefront position of social change. The very essence of their plan, however, bordered on indoctrination, a charge that never really disappeared. Bagenstos (1977), succinctly posed the important question: "How does one reconstruct society through schooling without indoctrination?" (6). Despite the obvious dilemma—how one accomplishes indoctrination and academic freedom simultaneously?—Rugg

very much believed in academic freedom, conveyed by his many thoughts regarding creativity and imagination. While his musings on the state of self-expression and raising the quality of American life alone likely eluded the gatekeepers, his strikes against pure capitalism did not. Influenced by the work of Van Wyck Brooks, Rugg found the "American 'mass mind' regrettably preoccupied with materialistic and acquisitive goals and unreceptive to the development of indigenous creative expression" (Carbone, 1971, 269). Moreover, when Rugg and other reconstructionists called for such things as a planned economy, they stirred the defensive forces of any number of conservative groups. Thus, the social problems Rugg identified—growing gap between rich and poor, exploitation of labor by big business, etc.—and his attempt to right the wrongs of social injustices through educational endeavors, were decried in conservative quarters as un-American. Hence, the controversy over Rugg's educational philosophy tainted his work on social reform through education, which resulted in an abandonment of his highly successful social studies texts and pamphlets, all of which provided students with contemporary problems of society for them to examine.

While other areas of Progressive reform met with some measure of success—such as political reformers who were successful in curbing patronage and crippling "boss rule," to a certain extent—Progressive educators met the stiff arm of resistance from a public who collectively believed that its schools should be the handmaidens of local interests. From the American Legion to the Daughters of the American Revolution, the guardians of capitalism and "patriots" of all persuasions spoke out against Progressive education with its focus on freedom of inquiry into social problems. In fact, by 1953, swept up in the current of ultra-patriotism, even the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) joined the earlier forces of big business and patriotic

groups in assembling information on Rugg and his programs (Nelson, 1978). As the tide of "Americanism" drew increasing numbers of teachers and professors into its dangerous waters, the classroom, once perceived as a place to explore new ideas or challenge existing ones, became a place where the teaching endeavor was suspect. In 1955, two sociologists embarked upon a landmark study regarding the effects of Cold War politics upon the concept of academic freedom. The decades since the debacle on the campus of Columbia University leading up to the McCarthy investigations into un-American activities had created a climate of fear and trepidation among university faculty regarding academic freedom. Despite the alarm, Lazarsfeld and Thielens, Jr., (1957/58) found that on the part of the professoriate, "fear for one's job security," was tempered by a "general concern about the state of academic freedom," and more interestingly, by "defiant resistance to the prevailing attacks" (244). This defiance notwithstanding, scores of educators in the Lazarsfeld and Thielens study reported that they were more guarded in what they presented in class, while others went so far as to withdraw entirely from politics or other like organizations.

The fifties, it seemed, dealt the final blow to Progressive education as it was envisioned by Rugg and his contemporaries, John Dewey and George Counts. Hence, the extremists were successful in convincing a fearful public that America's young minds were being slanted by the curriculum efforts of "sly educationists." Moreover, they were smug in their belief that they had been the first to raise the warning sign that "Progressive Education" was "Red-ucation" (Chmaj, 1962). As Morris (1957) so succinctly stated, "when everybody gets into the business of supervising and inspecting, ideas die. The fresh and invigorating spirit of inquiry is smothered by the overlay of conformity and acceptance. And public education, as the instrument of a free society, is drained of its principal strength, i.e., the capacity to provide youngsters with the

experience of critical thinking by which they mature and grow. The school, in these circumstances, ceases being the arena for learning how to think and becomes merely the conveyor belt for the transmission of bits of information to the next generation." (Morris, 1957, 219). In the end, Rugg's detractors may have derailed his social studies curriculum, but social education as a worthwhile educational endeavor continues today, not only as critical thinking methods, but also in the form of new educational approaches such as authentic learning and the current interest in service learning. Yet, perhaps another crisis will determine if it is only a matter of time before gatekeepers understand these contemporary terms.

References

Akenson, J. (1991, Winter). Linkages of art and social studies: Focus upon modern , J. (1991, Winter). Linkages of art and social studies: Focus upon modern

dance/ movement. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 19 (1), 95-108.

Anderson, H. R. (1939). An experimental program in social studies for grades I to XII. In James A. Michener (Ed.), *The future of the social studies*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: National Council for the Social Studies, 6-19.

Bagenstos, N. T. (1977, April). Social reconstruction: The controversy over the , N. T. (1977, April). Social reconstruction: The controversy over the textbooks of Harold Rugg. [Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association at their annual meeting.] ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. (ED 137 190).

Bergen, T. J. (1996, June). The social philosophy of public education. *Education in Change*, 62 (6) 22-27.

Carbone, P. F. (1971, Fall). The other side of Harold Rugg. *History of Education Quarterly*, 11 (3), 265-278.

Carbone, P. F. (1969, Spring). A critical analysis of Harold Rugg's views on creativity and knowledge. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 3 (2), 128-143.

Chmaj, B.E. (1962). Paranoid Patriotism. *The Atlantic Monthly*. November 91-97.

Cohen, P. (1995, August). Designing performance assessment tasks. *Education Update*. ASCD. 37(6), 1,4-5,8.

Cooper, J.M. (1997, Fall). Integrating technology into teacher preparation: *Quality Teaching*. NCATE. 1-2.

Cornett, J.W. (1993). Authentic assessment and thoughtful social studies teaching and learning. *Trends and Issues*. Florida Council for the Social Studies. Summer, 5-8.

Cronin, J. F. (1993, April). Four misconceptions about authentic learning. *Educational Leadership*. 50(7), 78-80.

Evans, R. and Saxe, D.W. (Eds.). (1996). *Handbook on Teaching Social Issues, NCSS Bulletin 93.* Washington, D.C.: National Council of the Social Studies.

Geocaris, C. (1997). Increasing Student Engagement: A Mystery Solved. Educational Leadership. December 1996/January 1997, 72-75.

Gerzon, M. (1997). Teaching Democracy by Doing It!. *Educational Leadership.* February, 6-11.

Goodson, M. R. (1987, October). *Human foresight and moral re-education. The work of the school.* [Paper presented at first meeting of the Education Section of the World Future Society]. ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. (ED 160 530).

Gordon, R. (1998a). A curriculum for authentic learning. *The Education Digest.* 63(7), 4-8.

Gordon, R. (1998b). Balancing real-world problems with real-world results. *Phi Delta Kappan.* 79(5), 390-393.

Griffin, A. (1942). *A Philosophical Approach to the Subject Matter Preparation of Teachers of History.* Washington, D.C.: National Council of the Social Studies.

Howlett, C.F. (1984). Academic Freedom versus loyalty at Columbia during World War I: a Case Study. *War & Society* 2(1) 43-53.

Hughes, A.S. (1997). Toward a more thoughtful professional education for social Studies teachers: Can problem-based learning contribute? *Theory and research in social education.* 25(4), 431-445.

Knox, H. M. (1975, October). The progressive development of J. F. Herbart's educational thought. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 23, 265-275.

Lazarsfeld, P.F. and W. Thielens, Jr. (1957/58). Social Scientists and Recent Threats to Academic Freedom. *Social Problems* 6 (2), 244-266.

Martorella, P.H. (1997). Technology and social studies. *Theory and research in social education.* 25(4), 511-514.

Means, B. and Olson, K. (1994, April). The link between technology and authentic learning. *Educational Leadership.* 51(7), 15-18.

Moreo, D. W. (1996). *Schools in the great depression.* New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Morris, V.C. (1957). Grass-roots-ism and the Public School. *School and Society.* June 217-219.

Muschinske, D. (1974, November). "American life, the social studies, and Harold Rugg." *The Social Studies.* 65 (6), 246-249.

Nagel, N.G. (1993). *Authentic learning authentic assessment: Let's begin with tomorrow's teachers.* ERIC Document Reproduction Number: (ED 412 184).

Nelson, L. R. and Drake, F. D. (1997, November). *William Van Till: A persistent Progressive's relationship to the national council for the social studies.* [Paper presented to the College and University Faculty Assembly of the National Council for the Social Studies at their annual meeting]. Cincinnati, Ohio: November 21.

Nelson, M. R. and Singleton, H. W. (1987, March). *Governmental surveillance of the three progressive educators.* [Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association at their annual meeting]. Toronto. ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. (ED 156 560).

Nelson, M. R. (1982, Fall). The Rugg brothers in social education. *Journal of thought.* 17 (3), 68-82.

Nelson, M. R. (1978, Summer). Rugg on Rugg: His theories and his curriculum. *Curriculum Inquiry.* 8 (2), 119-32.

Nelson, M.R. (1977, December). "The development of the Rugg social studies materials." *Theory and Research in Social Education.* 5 (3), 64-83.

Newmann, F.M. (1991). Linking restructuring to authentic student achievement. *Phi Delta Kappan.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. (ED 384 472)

Newmann, F. M. and others (1996). Authentic pedagogy and student performance. *American Journal of Education.* 104(4), 280-312.

Newmann, F. M. and others (1995a). Authentic pedagogy and student performance. Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association at their annual meeting (And

Francisco, CA, April 1995). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 389 679).

Newmann, F.M. and others (1995b). Authentic pedagogy: Standards that boost student performance. *Issues in Restructuring Schools.* Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools. Issue Report No. 8. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 390 906).

Newmann, F. M. and Wehlage, G. G. (1993). Five standards of authentic instruction. *Educational Leadership.* 50(7), 8-12.

Oliver, D. W. (1978, November-December). Reflections on Peter Carbone's the social and educational thought of Harold Rugg. *Social Education*, 593-7.

Parsons, J. (1986, December). *Social reconstructionism and the Alberta social studies curriculum.* ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. (ED 277 600).

Perkins, D. (1994). Putting Understanding Upfront. *Educational Leadership.* February, 4-7.

Reeves, T. C. (1996). Technology in teacher education: From electronic tutor To cognitive tool. *Action in Teacher Education.* XVII(4), 74-78.

Reitman, S. W. (1972). The reconstructionism of Harold Rugg. *Educational Theory*, 22 (1), 47-57.

Riley, K.L. and Stern, B.S. (1998). *Authentic Learning and Foundations: Students and Teachers Examine California's Proposition 187.* Presented to the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies at their annual meeting, November 22.

Riley, K.L and Stern, B.S. (1997). *Curriculum, Teaching and Authentic Assessment: Using Qualitative Methodology to Bridge Theory into Practice.* A paper presented to the American Association of Teachers of Curriculum at their annual meeting, Indianapolis, October 16.

Riley, K.L . and Stern, B.S. (1997). *Teaching Difficult Concepts Through Authentic Assessment.* A paper presented to the National Council of the Social Studies at their annual meeting: Cincinnati, November 22.

Riley, K.L. and Stern, B.S. (1997) *Understanding Cultural Influence: Authentic Assessment and Qualitative Methodology.* A paper presented to the College and University Faculty Assembly of the National Council for the Social Studies at their annual meeting, Cincinnati, November 20.

Ross, E.W. (1997). Democracy and disagreements: Some things to do on our way to Anaheim. *Theory and research in social education.* 26(1), 9-11.

Rugg, E. (1939). "A teacher-pupil program in citizenship education." *The Future of the Social Studies*, James A. Michener, (Ed.) Number One. Cambridge, Massachusetts: National Council for the Social Studies Curriculum Series, 140-158.

Rugg, H. O. (1939). "Curriculum-design in the social sciences: What I believe ¼." *The Future of the Social Studies*, James A. Michener, (Ed.). Cambridge, Massachusetts: National Council for the Social Studies Curriculum Series, 140-158.

Rugg, H.O. (1927). Freeing the curriculum in Weaver, A. (Compiler). (1971). *New Era*, 52 (7), 599-603.

Rugg, H.O. (1923). Foreword: and Do the social studies prepare pupils adequately for life activities? (Chapter I). In G.M. Whipple (Ed). *Twenty-second yearbook of the national society for the study of education. Part II.* National Society for the Study of Education. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company. vii-27.

Rugg, H.O., Rugg, E. and Schweppe, E. (1923). A proposed social science course for the junior high school (Chapter XI) in G.M. Whipple (Ed.). *Twenty-second yearbook of the national society for the study of education. Part II.* National Society for the Study of Education. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company. 185-207.

Rugg, H.O. (1923). Problems of contemporary life as the basis for curriculum-making in the social studies (Chapter XV) in G.M. Whipple (Ed.), *Twenty-second yearbook of the national society for the study of education, Part II.* National Society for the Study of Education,. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company.260-273.

Ruja, H. (1961). The Communist Menace, the Supreme Court, and Academic Freedom. *Western Political Quarterly* 14 (3), 715-726.

Rutkowski, Edward. Papers and proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Midwest History of Education Society (11th, Chicago, Illinois, October 24-25, 1975. *Journal of Midwest History of Education Society* 4, (1976). Sherry, L. (1997). *Linking technology with promising practices to improve teaching and learning.* ERIC Document Reproduction Number: (ED 414 277).

Stanley, W. B. (1982, Winter). A reinterpretation of Harold Rugg's role in the , W. B. (1982, Winter). A reinterpretation of Harold Rugg's role in the foundation of modern social education. *Journal of Thought.* 17 (4), *85-94.*

Stern, B.S. and K.L. Riley. (1999). Reflecting on the Common Good: Harold Rugg and the Social Reconstructionists. *A Paper presented to the National Council of the Social Studies at its annual meeting.* Orlando: November 20.

Strike, K. A. (1988, October). The ethics of teaching. *Phi Delta Kappan.* 70 (2), 156-58.

Strong, R., Silver, H.F., and Robinson, A. (1995). What Do Student Want? *Educational Leadership*, September, 8-12.

Thomas, T. P. (1999, Spring). The difficulties and successes of Reconstructionist practice: Theodore Brameld and the floodwood project. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision.* 14 (3), 260-282.

Thomas, L., Larson, A. Clift, R. and Levin, J. (1996). Integrating technology in teacher education programs. *Action in Teacher Education.* XVII(4), 1-8.

Wiggins, G. (1990). The case for authentic assessment. *ERIC Digest.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 328 611).

Wiske, M.S. (1994, February). How teaching for understanding changes the rules in the classroom. *Educational Leadership.* 51(5),19-21.

Wittenburg, S. L., Johnson, T. E. (1982). *Curriculum change: Old wine in new bottles.* ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. (ED 235 119).

Woodward, C. Vann. (1962). The Unreported Crisis in the Southern Colleges. *Harpers Magazine.* October, 82-89.

Zeichner, K.M. (1992). *Connecting genuine teacher development to the struggle for social justice. Issue paper 92-1.* ERIC Document Reproduction Number: (ED 344 881).